

ANALYZING THE FACTORS BEHIND CODE-SWITCHING BY PETRA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY'S ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS

Shintia Adiningsih Wigati^{1*} and Natasya Aurelia Puspo²

^{1,2}Universitas Kristen Petra, Indonesia

a11200067@john.petra.ac.id¹, and a11200009@john.petra.ac.id²

*correspondence: a11200067@john.petra.ac.id¹

<https://doi.org/10.24071/uc.v4i1.5600>

received 12 September 2022; accepted 12 April 2023

Abstract

English Department students are encouraged to communicate in English, especially within the classroom. However, English is not their mother tongue; hence this leads to a lack of English proficiency to support daily means of communication. This factor triggers the prevalence of code-switching by English Department students. The phenomenon also happens among Petra Christian University's students. This paper would like to analyze the factors that encourage and the factors which discourage students to do code-switching using Braun and Clarke's analytical procedure. To obtain the necessary data, we distributed questionnaires related to code-switching phenomena to 47 students of Petra Christian University's English Department and interviewed 21 of the selected respondents from both English for Creative Industry and English for Business majors. The questionnaire and interview questions inquired regarding the interlocutors and the factors which respectively encourage and discourage them to practice code switch. Findings indicate that communication efficiency, foreign language practice, habit, level of intimacy, and inability to translate English expressions to Indonesian encourage English Department students of Petra Christian University to perform code-switching. Meanwhile, proficiency level, professionalism, avoiding potential misunderstanding, and level of intimacy discourage English Department students of Petra Christian University from performing code-switching.

Keywords: code-switching, English Department students, second language

Introduction

As English has been declared as the global language, interest to learn the language deeper has grown throughout the globe. This is achieved through numerous formal and informal methods. Crystal (2003) stated that English is currently the most frequently spoken foreign language in over 100 nations, including China, Russia, Germany, Spain, Egypt, and Brazil, and it is becoming the predominant foreign language in schools in the majority of these countries. One of which is by studying English Literature at the university level. However, difficulty arises as English is not the first language in many countries, such as Indonesia.



English Department students in Indonesia face difficulty as they are demanded to communicate in English among their English Department peers. Yet, they face a lack of room to practice English as they communicate in Indonesian in their daily lives. This results in a glaring gap in English proficiency between the proficiency level needed to support their communication and the level of proficiency they currently possess. To fill in the gap, English Department students depend on the use of code-switching. Mauliddiyah, Munir, & Mustofa (2020) argued that code-switching in the classroom must be identified while studying a foreign or second language. Therefore, the use of code-switching in the classroom, especially for bilingual students like the English department's students, is inevitable.

Code-switching is described as combining terms or phrases from two languages throughout speaking or writing (Al-Qaysi, 2019). The phenomenon often occurs among those who are bilingual and/or multilingual. Bilingual and multilingual are terms which describe those who possess abilities in two or various languages. The group can often be found especially among English Department students of Indonesian universities. The English Department students in Indonesia have Bahasa Indonesia as their mother tongue as they develop their proficiency in English through their academic activities. English Department students tend to face the demand to express themselves in English, especially within the classroom. Meanwhile, some of them have difficulty finding fitting expressions to deliver their message in English. Thus, they choose to employ the languages they are familiar with to bridge the demand to communicate in English and the need to deliver their means accurately. This phenomenon is known as code-switching (hereafter to be referred to as CS).

This study aims to analyze the factors that encourage and the factors which discourage students of Petra Christian University's English Department students to do code-switching using Braun & Clarke's (2006) analytical procedure. The data were obtained through the distribution of questionnaires and interviews of selected respondents. The questions varied from their preferred language in communication to their reasons for choosing either to perform or not perform CS. Through these methods, findings indicate that factors such as communication efficiency, foreign language practice, habit, level of intimacy, and inability to translate English expressions to Indonesian encourage participants to perform CS. However, factors such as proficiency level, professionalism, potential misunderstanding, and level of intimacy discourage participants from performing CS. Through this study, authors hope to discover the phenomenon of CS, especially within the scope of English Department students.

Theoretical review

Code-switching (CS) itself is rooted in linguistics, particularly sociolinguistic. According to Finegan (2003), linguistics itself can be defined as the systematic inquiry into human language—into its structures and uses and the relationship between them, as well as into its development through history and its acquisition by children and adults. Linguistics explores both language structure (and its underlying grammatical competence) and language use (and its underlying communicative competence) (Nordquist, 2019). In addition, it is also understood that in general, linguistics is the study of language. Saussure (2011) thought of linguistics as the study of the manifestation of human speech. It concerns the history

of languages and the social or cultural influences which shape the development of language.

Next, sociolinguistics is known to be a part of the linguistics field. It is known to be the part of the field which deals with how the language is used and thought of in the real world (HS, 2015). Wardhaugh (2021) thought of sociolinguistics as the field of study which concerns the relationships between language and society. It has the goal to reach a better understanding of the structure of language and how languages function in communication. Sociolinguistic itself emphasizes on how language functions in the society (Wibowo, Yuniasih, & Nelfianti, 2017). According to Burling and Fishman (1972), sociolinguistics can be defined as both the behavior toward language (attitudes, movements, planning) and language concomitants of social processes, large and small (societal formation, societal interaction, societal change, and dislocation).

“Code-switching is viewed as a bilingual/multilingual behavior that is employed not just as a conversational tool, but also as a technique to construct, preserve, and designate ethnic boundaries and identities,” Helen said in Lowi (2005). Code-switching also provides vast clues of the speaker’s social identity which may be helpful to ensure better communication (Gardner-Chloros, 2009). People who work in a multilingual setting are more likely to switch codes as humans are more likely to switch codes depending on the social situation (Sinaga & Hutahean, 2020). Code-switching serves not just as a linguistic style, but also as a means for communicating messages, ideas, and opinions (Lismay, 2017). Next, code-switching can also be a tool for students to better understand the target language during the learning session. Köylü (2018) suggests that teachers can urge students to transcode code as an effective technique for learning the target language in many circumstances. Thus, code-switching is one of the media that is often found in educational institutions, especially institutions that use more than one language.

Method

This research employed a mixed-method design. The mixed-method design is categorized into the explanatory design, exploratory design, and triangulation design (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2016). The data was first qualitatively transcribed, compiled, and examined before being quantitatively evaluated by quantifying the frequency of occurrences. The authors distributed questionnaires to the 47 English Department members of Petra Christian University.

The respondents range from alumni to the 2021 batch, and the participants’ age ranges from 18 to 23. 96% of the respondents have Bahasa Indonesia as their mother tongue. All of them reside in Indonesia. Next, the authors interviewed 21 respondents. The last question of the questionnaire inquired about whether or not the respondents were willing to be interviewed regarding their answers. Hence, the authors held 1-on-1 interviews with the respondents through the Zoom meeting. A total of 147 minutes of interviews were conducted to study the matter thoroughly. The available data were then transcribed and qualitatively evaluated according to Braun and Clarke’s (2006) analytical procedure.

Findings and Discussion

First, the authors produced a questionnaire with the questions as follows:

Table 1. Questions for the questionnaire

No	Questions	Code
1.	I always use English to communicate on daily basis (both inside and outside class activities)	Q1
2.	In communicating with peers from the same major (English for Creative Industry program and English for Business program), I always use English.	Q2
3.	I always speak English with Petra Christian University English Department lecturers (both inside and outside class activities).	Q3
4.	I feel that English terms can represent my feelings/emotions.	Q4
5.	I often use English terms because I am unable to find the terms that have exact meanings in Indonesian (and vice versa).	Q5
6.	I often choose to insert some English terms whenever I communicate with someone else to avoid misunderstandings.	Q6
7.	I avoid inserting some English terms while communicating with people who are not fluent in English.	Q7
8.	I often use English terms while communicating with people whom I think are fluent in English.	Q8
9.	Sometimes I consciously try not to add some English terms because I am afraid that the interlocutors would think that I am showing off my English skills.	Q9

The questionnaire itself was made on Google Forms and was distributed through Petra Christian University's English Department groups. This was done to reach out to as many potential respondents who were willing. The questionnaire is distributed in the form of a linear scale with numbers one (1) to four (4), where one (1) represents "Strongly Disagree," two (2) represents "Disagree," three (3) represents "Agree," and four (4) represents "Strongly Agree." This resulted in 48 responses to the aforementioned questions. Each of the 48 respondents gave a different answer to each question. The percentage of each scale was used by the author to analyze the responses of the respondents. Following the percentage, the authors interviewed 21 respondents who were willing to elaborate on their responses.

The interview questions are as follows:

Table 2. Questions for interview

No.	Interview Questions	Code
1.	To begin, are you familiar with "code-switching"? Please provide a	I-Q1

	brief description.	
2.	With whom have you been most aware of using code-switching? What are the factors behind your decision? (Both internal and external factors).	I-Q2
3.	With whom do you try not to use code-switching when communicating? What are the factors behind this decision (Both internal and external factors)?	I-Q3
4.	Apart from the ease of communication (to make it easier to convey the meaning of communication and the absence of foreign terms that can be translated into your mother tongue), what are other factors that encourage you to use code-switching?	I-Q4
5.	Apart from the lack of English language skills from the other person and you don't want to seem arrogant about your English language skills, what are other factors that discourage you from using code-switching?	I-Q5

Through this, 21 respondents provided answers to the questions above. Then, the authors proceeded with a qualitative analysis of the acquired data. The authors employed a thematic analysis based on Braun and Clarke's (2006) analytical procedure. The goal of conducting a thematic analysis itself is to identify themes which are either important or interesting which may contribute greatly to the research issue (Maguire, et al., 2017).

To begin, all of the interview transcripts were read and examined several times to identify the data. Following that, the data was analyzed and classified. The categories were then reviewed to create a thematic map for the study. The categories were re-examined and redefined to ensure that each of them was assigned to the appropriate category.

Through a questionnaire answered by 48 respondents English Department students of Petra Christian University, the authors found that all respondents had different answers. The analysis of the questionnaire is as follows:

Q1. I always use English to communicate on daily basis (both inside and outside class activities)

In response to this statement, 29 people (61.7 %) stated that they did not agree with the statement that English is their daily language. This demonstrates that the use of English in Petra Christian University's English Department occurs only at certain times. According to the available data, only 10 respondents (21.3 %) said they use English in their activities, both in and out of class. Furthermore, six (6) respondents (12.8 %) strongly disagreed with the provided statement, while just four (4) respondents (4.3 percent) firmly agreed to adopt English as their everyday language.

Q2. In communicating with peers from the same major (English for Creative Industry program and English for Business program), I always use English.

Regarding the second question, 27 respondents (57.4%) indicated that they disagree with completely speaking in English with their Petra Christian University English Department peers. This is supported by the presence of ten (21.3 %) respondents who claimed that they strongly agreed with conversing in English with peers in the same major. This data suggests that the majority of respondents do not utilize English in their daily life, particularly when spending time with peers from the same major, notably English for Creative Industry and English for Business. Lipski (1985) argued that situational and cultural variables drive code-switching, and the switch occurs deliberately and knowingly between two languages. Only eight (8) respondents (17%) said they “Agree” and two (2) respondents (4.3%) said they “Strongly agree” to using English in talking with friends in the English Department.

Q3. I always speak English with Petra Christian University English Department lecturers (both inside and outside class activities).

In Petra Christian University’s communication process between students and English Department lecturers, 27 respondents (57.4 percent) said “Agree,” while 17 respondents (36.2 percent) said, “Strongly Agree.” This proportion shows that the majority of respondents actively utilize English in particular contexts, one of which is while speaking with lecturers. Only three (3) respondents (6.4 percent) responded that they disagreed with the English Department's lecturers on communicating actively in English.

Q4. I feel that English terms can represent my feelings/emotions.

With the question indicating that the English terminology can describe their feelings or emotions, 24 respondents (51.1 percent) said “Agree,” while 18 respondents (38.3 percent) said, “Strongly Agree.” Only four (4) respondents (8.5%) responded “Disagree,” and one (1) respondent (2.1%) opposed this assertion by choosing “Strongly Disagree”. These findings indicate that the use of English terms is not uncommon and has even become one of Petra Christian University English Department students' daily accommodations.

Q5. I often use English terms because I am unable to find the terms that have exact meanings in Indonesian (and vice versa).

A total of 25 respondents (53.2 percent) said they “Strongly Agree,” and 18 respondents (38.2%) said they “Agree” that they use English terms frequently in their daily lives. Meanwhile, three (3) respondents (6.4%) stated “Disagree,” and one (1) respondent (2.1%) stated “Strongly Disagree” with using English terms in everyday life. This indicates their lack of inability to translate expressions into the language in which they communicate. In addition, this also shows how they tend to avoid potential misunderstandings; hence, they choose to use English terms. Junaidi (2019) argued that code-switching is a common occurrence, particularly in multilingual and multicultural settings. When learning a language, one must deal with two languages at the same time: the mother tongue and the target language. The usage of CS in daily life is unavoidable.

Q6. I often choose to insert some English terms whenever I communicate with someone else to avoid misunderstandings.

To avoid misunderstandings, 20 respondents (42.6 %) stated “Strongly Agree,” and 15 respondents (31.9 %) stated “Agree” to insert English terms in everyday life. Only nine (9) respondents (19.1 %) disagreed with this statement, while three (3) respondents (6.4 %) strongly disagreed. These findings indicate how Petra Christian University English Department students prefer to exercise code switch to ensure the precision of their delivered means of communication.

Q7. I avoid inserting some English terms while communicating with people who are not fluent in English.

A total of 30 respondents (63%) “Agree” not to insert English terms to the other person they think is not very fluent in speaking English. A total of 17 respondents (36.1%) expressed “Disagree” with this statement. Through these findings, it can be concluded that the majority of respondents practice a degree of awareness within the option to insert English terms in conversations. This may indicate some factors they consider regarding performing CS such as communication efficiency (in which they avoid the risk of having to explain themselves to interlocutors).

Q8. I often use English terms while communicating with people whom I think are fluent in English.

For using English terms to the interlocutor whom they presume is fluent in English, 22 respondents (44.7%) said “Agree,” and another 16 respondents (34 %) said, “Strongly Agree.” This demonstrates that the majority of respondents are only comfortable speaking in English in specific situations and conditions, one of which is with an interlocutor who understands English. Only 10 respondents (21.3 %) said they “Disagree” with using English terms to exchange ideas with friends or relatives who are fluent in English.

Q9. Sometimes I consciously try not to add some English terms because I am afraid that the interlocutors would think that I am showing off my English skills.

To consciously not use or insert English terms to the interlocutor, 19 respondents (40.4%) said “Agree,” and eight (8) said, “Strongly Agree.” This is due to the assumption that spreads in the surrounding environment, which frequently undervalues people who speak English, so many parties, including Petra Christian University English Department students, avoid speaking in English. A total of 11 respondents (23.4%) stated “Disagree,” and nine (9) respondents (19.1%) stated “Strongly Disagree” not to use English terms in everyday life.

Through the responses to the questionnaire, it can be concluded that CS is a consistent phenomenon among English Department students of Petra Christian University. This could be seen in how 24 respondents (51.1 %) said “Agree,” and 18 respondents (38.3 %) said “Strongly Agree.” to the question (Q4) which said that the English terminology can describe their feelings or emotions. Hofman (1991) argued that to discuss a particular topic, speakers are free to express their emotions in a language that is not in their everyday use. Therefore, in the English department, the usage of English words and vice versa is fairly widespread among students. In addition, a total of 25 respondents (53.2 %) said they “Strongly Agree,” and 18

respondents (38.2%) said they “Agree” that they use English terms frequently in their daily lives (Q5). The occurrence of CS can be ultimately seen in Q6 where 20 respondents (42.6 %) stated “Strongly Agree,” and 15 respondents (31.9 %) stated “Agree” to insert English terms in everyday life to avoid misunderstandings. Sert (2005) stated that CS is a means of shifting the intended meaning for a student's potentially conflictive language use (that is, the student wishes to avoid misunderstandings or speak things indirectly for specific reasons). This does not necessarily mean they lack competence in the said language; but rather they would like to avoid misunderstandings (Muthusamy, Muniandy, Kandasamy, Hussin, Subramaniam, & Farashaiyan, 2020).

To further investigate the factors behind CS, the authors conducted interviews with 21 of the respondents. Through this interview, five categories were identified as the factors which encourage the English Department students of Petra Christian University to perform CS. Factors that enhance respondents to participate in CS include: (1) communication efficiency, (2) foreign language practice, (3) habit, (4) level of intimacy, and (5) inability to translate expressions to the target language. Meanwhile, the four following factors are preventing respondents from conducting CS in their daily lives: (1) proficiency level, (2) professionalism, (3) avoiding potential misunderstanding, and (4) level of intimacy.

Table 3. Factors that encourage CS performance

Communication efficiency	66.67%
Foreign language practice	38.09%
Habit	42.8%
Level of intimacy	33.34%
Inability to translate expressions to the target language	42.8%

Communication efficiency

As the authors asked the question I-Q2, a total of 14 respondents stated that communication efficiency was one of the most important reasons they used CS. They stated that CS could assist them, as well as the interlocutors, in conveying the meaning of their assertion; thus, they do not need to explain the meaning of their statement repeatedly during the conversation. Junaidi (2019) stated, “Code-switching can be a useful strategy in classroom interaction if the aim is to make meaning clear and to transfer the knowledge to students in an efficient way.” As respondents seek to engage in constructive discussion, particularly with classmates in the Petra Christian University English Department, CS performance is one of the most effective ways to improve the effectiveness of communication.

Foreign language practice

“Why do you tend to do CS despite the English Department setting encouraging you to speak English all the time?” the author inquired during the interview. Eight (8) respondents said that CS is an effective way to learn the target language. They can express themselves freely while practicing some English

vocabulary with their classmates in Petra Christian University's English Department.

Habit

Given that all respondents are English Department students who are explicitly required to speak English in their daily lives, the habit becomes the second most important factor in using CS. Respondents become accustomed to using CS in the campus environment, particularly with their fellow students, as a result of frequent exposure to various English-language media. Given that all respondents work in the English department, where they are required to actively utilize L2 through various media, exposure to two languages, namely mother tongue (L1) and target language (L2), has become a habit. Han, Li & Fillipi (2022) contended that code-switching processing is dependent on bilinguals' habitual language control, which is mediated by communicative needs in a given language context.

Level of intimacy

Given that the respondents come from a culture where at least two languages are spoken, Indonesian and English, they tend to apply CS with their peers since they feel more comfortable and more secure with each other. Respondents stated that CS can be used to more readily and comfortably form stronger social connections with people.

Inability to translate expressions to the target language

A total of nine (9) respondents noted in the interview that the usage of CS is also impacted by some terminology from their mother language that is difficult to translate into English, and vice versa. They discovered that if these terms had to be translated into the target language first, they would sound highly awkward. According to them, CS allows them to convey their thoughts and ideas without having to strain to translate terminology such as idioms into the target language. Skiba (1997) asserts that the inability of students to express themselves and transmit their messages in language classes is one of the causes that explain code changes, and code changes serve to maintain continuity in language and do not interfere with the expressive flow of linguistics. To maintain a conversation, the respondents chose to perform CS since they believe that CS helps them to convey the message in the target language readily.

Next, four categories were also identified as the factors which discourage the respondents of the study to perform CS.

Table 4. Factors that discourage CS performance

Proficiency level	42.8%
Professionalism	61.9%
Avoiding potential misunderstanding	57.3%
Level of intimacy	42.8%

Proficiency level

Nine (9) of the 21 respondents agree that their level of expertise is among the barriers to using CS in Petra Christian University's English Department. Several respondents mentioned that they were hesitant to perform CS with people since they are perceived to be particularly competent in the target language. Another explanation is that some individuals around them do not speak their target language, therefore they do not participate in CS to have a fruitful discussion with their interlocutors. Hughes, Shaunessy, Brice, Ratliff, & McHatton (2006) suggest that code-switching can be seen as a negative social trait by excluded members of the group (such as monolingual speakers). From this research, it can be seen that the respondents avoid CS since their interlocutors are not fluent in the target language, and they would like to engage in the talk by conversing in one language only.

Professionalism

13 of the 21 respondents stated that the major reason they do not utilize CS is to appear more professional, especially in formal settings. They are hesitant to use CS in formal contexts, such as classes and meetings since they want to respect the other person and appear more serious when communicating. Junaidi (2019) suggests "code exchange may bring an inharmonious relationship between speakers and language community, because, in their respective cultures, the words may not carry the same value, status, and functions." In a formal setting, people want to appear as professional as possible. Therefore, the possibility of performing CS is very small.

Avoiding potential misunderstanding

When the authors addressed questions I-Q5 during the interview, 12 of the 21 respondents stated that CS might cause misunderstandings, especially when conversing with interlocutors who are not proficient in the target language. To prevent this, the respondents chose not to utilize CS at all so that the message they wanted to send could be effectively transmitted and they did not have to spend additional time explaining the objective and purpose of the discussion.

Level of intimacy

Following up on the professionalism factor, which is one of the barriers for respondents to perform CS, respondents reported that respondents' proximity to interlocutors was also one of the reasons for not doing CS. Respondents stated that they would avoid CS with interlocutors with whom they do not have intimate connections, such as university staff, and with whom they have high regard, such as lecturers.

Conclusion

Code-switching is a phenomenon that is quite familiar among Petra Christian University students. Various factors were identified as the factors which either encourage or discourage the students. This study provides further insight regarding not only how apparent the phenomenon of code-switching is, but also the factors which affect its occurrence. The findings indicate that five (5) factors encourage students to perform CS, which are (1) communication efficiency, (2) foreign language practice, (3) habit, (4) level of intimacy, and (5) inability to translate

expressions to the target language. The most powerful aspect of CS is communication efficiency, which ranks first. This is because of the respondents' ease and convenience in discussing with interlocutors at Petra Christian University, particularly in the English Department. Another distinguishing factor to encourage CS is the inability to translate expressions into the target language. Furthermore, habit holds the same weight as the incapacity to translate expressions to the target language.

This research also found that four (4) factors discourage English department students from performing CS, which are (1) proficiency level, (2) professionalism, (3) avoiding potential misunderstanding, and (4) level of intimacy. This study found that professionalism ranks first as the main factor. Another factor is that CS may result in the occurrence of misunderstanding during the conversation. The proficiency level is another factor that makes respondents reluctant to do CS.

This research focuses on the motivations and factors of Petra Christian University's English department students regarding CS attempts. For future research, the authors would recommend the study to further investigate the types of code-switching which are usually done among English Department students. Future researchers can also investigate further three (3) types of code-switching, which are inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, and tag-switching (Hamers & Blanc, 2003). Moreover, the scope of the code-switching performance study can also be enlarged so that the authors can acquire more varied data, given that this research is solely confined to students. Through this, we can understand the occurrence of code-switching, the factors, and the types which are exercised among English Department students.

References

- Al-Qaysi, N. (2019). Students and educators' attitudes towards code-switching: A longitudinal study. *International Journal of Information Technology and Language Studies*, 3(2), 61-72. Retrieved from <http://journals.sfu.ca/ijitls>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Burling, R., & Fishman, J. A. (1972). Sociolinguistics: A brief introduction. *Language*, 48(1), 233-236. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412510>
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- De Saussure, F., & Sechehaye, M. A. (1959). *Course in general linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). C. Bally & A. Sechehaye (Eds.), (pp. 68-73). New York: Philosophical Library.
- Finegan, E. (2003). Linguistic prescription: Familiar practices and new perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 213-224. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050300028X>
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609787>
- HS, A. F. (2019). Sociolinguistics in language teaching. *MABASAN*, 9(2), 66-77. <https://doi.org/10.26499/mab.v9i2.159>

- Han, X., Li, W., & Filippi, R. (2022). The effects of habitual code-switching in bilingual language production on cognitive control. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 25(5), 869-889. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728922000244>
- Hamers, J., & Blanc, M. (2000). *Bilinguality and bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511605796>
- Hoffman, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. New York: Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842035>
- Hughes, C. E., Shaunessy, E. S., Brice, A. R., Ratliff, M. A., & McHatton, P. A. (2006). Code switching among bilingual and limited English proficient students: Possible indicators of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30(1), 7-28.
- Junaidi, A. M. (2019). The communicative function and the benefit of code switching within bilingual education program or multilingual children in learning English. *Jurnal Ilmiah Rinjani: Media Informasi Ilmiah Universitas Gunung Rinjani*, 7(2), 59-66. <https://doi.org/10.12345/jir.v7i2.129>
- Köylü, Z. (2018). The use of L1 in the tertiary L2 classroom: Code-switching factors, functions, and attitudes in Turkey. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 15(2), 271–289.
- Lipski, J. (1985). *Linguistic aspects of Spanish-English language switching*. Arizona: Center for Latin American Studies.
- Lismay, L. (2017). Reasons of using code switching by the head of Universitas Mahaputera Muhammad Yamin in the speeches on graduation day. *Journal of English Education*, 3(1).
- Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2016). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lowi, Rosamina. (2005). *Code switching: An examination of naturally occurring conversation*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Maguire, M., et al. (2017). Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning and teaching scholars. *AISHE-J: The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 9(3). Retrieved from <https://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/335>
- Mauliddiyah, A., Munir, A., Mustofa, A. (2020). The use of code-switching in the EFL classroom of first-grade at junior high school. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, 2(1), 143-148. <https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v2i1.2266>
- Muthusamy, P., Muniandy, R., Kandasamy, S.S., Hussin, O.H., Subramaniam, M., & Farashaiyan, A. (2020). Factors of code-switching among bilingual international students in Malaysia. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(4), 332-338. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n4p332>
- Nordquist, R. (2019, July 3). *A brief introduction to the many branches of linguistics*. ThoughtCo. Retrieved July 22, 2022, from <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-linguistics-1691012>
- Saussure, F. de. (2011). *Course in general linguistics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. *Online Submission*, 11(8), 1-6.

- Sinaga, C., Hutahean, D. (2020). An analysis of code switching used by Reza Arap on Deddy Corbuzier's YouTube channel. *Journal of English Teaching as a Foreign Language*, 6(3), 31-47.
- Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The internet TESL journal*, 3(10). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching.html>
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2021). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wibowo, A. I., Yuniasih, I., & Nelfianti, F. (2017). Analysis of types code switching and code mixing by the sixth president of Republic Indonesia's speech at the national of independence day. *Progressive*, 12(2), 13-22.